

Photocurable Scaffolds for Cultured Meat and Food Biofabrication

Food-Grade Chemistry, Mass Transport, Texture and Process Qualification

Juan Seguro

3Dresyns by Resyner Technologies S.L.

© 2026 Juan Seguro. All Rights Reserved.

Correspondence: info@3Dresyns.com · www.3Dresyns.com

ER-194 · Engineering Review · Version 0.3 · 12 September 2026

Statement of Significance

Photocuring can manufacture cell-laden structures with controlled external geometry and internal transport features, but a printable research bioink is not thereby a food-qualified manufacturing system. The same formulation and exposure choices that establish shape also influence cell-supporting conditions, residual chemistry, transport architecture and the mechanical state later interpreted as texture. ER-194 defines an evidence-bounded qualification framework that keeps these questions separate. It uses one directly read DLP/GelMA cultured-meat proof of concept as the primary anchor and does not generalise its recipe, equipment settings or biological results into universal food specifications.

Abstract

Photocurable biofabrication offers spatial control over cell-laden constructs, yet its use in cultured-meat research creates a coupled qualification problem. Chemistry, optical cure, cell compatibility, mass transport, mechanical response and food-use acceptability cannot be inferred from one another. A directly read proof-of-concept study manufactured centimetre-scale constructs by digital light processing using a GelMA-based, cell-laden bioink containing LAP and tartrazine, incorporated microchannels, and assessed printability, cell response, differentiation and compression in that specific system [1]. The authors also identified limitations relevant to food translation, including doxycycline toxicity, animal-derived gelatin and fetal bovine serum, and called for alternative materials and processes [1]. ER-194 converts those observations into a conservative engineering framework. It distinguishes research feasibility from food qualification, treats exposure as a formulation-dependent process variable, requires transport and texture to be measured in declared states, and separates scaffold/process qualification from food-contact and novel-food regulatory determinations. No universal formulation, exposure, texture target, safety limit or scale-up rule is proposed.

Keywords: cultured meat; food biofabrication; photopolymerisation; digital light processing; GelMA; mass transport; texture; process qualification

1. Scope and ownership

ER-194 addresses photocurable scaffolds and cell-laden feedstocks used in cultured-meat and food-biofabrication research. It owns the coupled materials and process question: how formulation identity, optical cure, geometry, transport, cell-supporting state and mechanical response should be connected in a qualification argument.

This review does not determine whether a substance is food-grade, food-contact compliant or acceptable under any novel-food regime. Those are separate legal and toxicological determinations. It does not establish nutritional value, sensory equivalence, economic viability, industrial scalability or consumer acceptance. It also does not claim that any 3Dresyns product is qualified for food or novel-food use.

The evidence base is deliberately narrow. The primary anchor is the directly read study by Jeong et al. [1]. Study-specific values are not reproduced as transferable recipes. Engineering requirements not presented as findings of that study are explicitly framed here as proposed qualification logic.

2. What the primary anchor demonstrates

Jeong et al. reported a proof of concept for centimetre-scale cultured-meat research using a photocrosslinkable, cell-laden GelMA bioink processed by digital light projection [1]. The reported bioink included GelMA, LAP photoinitiator, tartrazine photoabsorber and bovine fibroblast-derived cells in buffered aqueous medium [1]. The construct incorporated microchannels intended to support transport through its volume [1].

The study connected exposure selection with photorheology, printability and cell viability rather than treating exposure as an isolated machine setting [1]. It evaluated cell viability or proliferation, differentiation, print fidelity and compression response within the reported experimental system [1]. These observations establish that optical processing, construct architecture, cell state and mechanical testing can be examined together in a cultured-meat research workflow.

The result remains bounded. It does not establish that the complete formulation is suitable for food use, that the process is scalable, or that the measured compression response is sensory equivalence to conventional meat. The article itself identifies doxycycline toxicity, animal-derived gelatin and fetal bovine serum as limitations and points to the need for alternatives [1].

3. Qualification starts with feedstock identity

The term bioink can hide multiple independently important components: the polymer or macromer, photoinitiator, optical modifier, solvent or buffer, cells, culture supplements and any rheology or stability aids. A qualification record should identify each component, its function, supplier or source, lot where relevant, concentration basis and state at use.

Food-use acceptability cannot be inherited from one familiar component. An edible colourant does not qualify the initiator, polymer source, culture supplements, impurities, reaction products or manufacturing environment. Likewise, biological performance in culture does not answer migration, toxicology, allergen, compositional or regulatory questions.

For research comparability, the minimum identity record should distinguish material as received from the working mixture and from the cured construct. It should document preparation order, mixing, hold time, temperature history and any filtration or degassing. These are proposed controls, not results reported by [1]. Their purpose is to prevent formulation variability from being misread as an exposure, cell or geometry effect.

4. Photocuring is a coupled material-process operation

Photocuring converts a liquid or soft feedstock into a shaped network by delivering light through a formulation that absorbs and scatters it. In a cell-laden system, exposure cannot be selected solely for geometric completion. The relevant operating window must reconcile build fidelity with the biological and chemical state required by the intended research task.

The primary anchor supports this coupled view because exposure was linked to photorheology, printability and cell viability in the studied system [1]. It does not support transferring the reported wavelength, irradiance, exposure duration or layer strategy to another resin, printer or geometry.

A defensible process record should therefore state the light engine, nominal spectral band, exposure control method, layer strategy, build orientation and feedstock optical state. Verification should use the actual formulation and representative geometry. A machine setting is not a dose specification unless its delivery and material context are defined.

5. Cure adequacy is not a single endpoint

Shape retention, local network formation, residual mobile species and cell response are related but non-equivalent endpoints. A construct can appear geometrically complete while retaining an unsuitable chemical or mechanical state. Conversely, a condition that increases conversion or stiffness can be incompatible with the cell-supporting objective.

ER-194 therefore proposes a state matrix rather than one pass/fail cure label. The matrix should include at least geometry or print fidelity, a declared measure of network or mechanical state, relevant extractable or residual-chemistry evidence, and biological response for the intended research model. If food use is claimed later, separate food-safety and regulatory evidence must be added; it cannot be substituted by the biological response of the cultured cells.

Acceptance limits must be system-specific. This review provides no universal conversion, gel fraction, residual level, viability threshold or exposure window.

6. Mass transport is an architectural requirement

Centimetre-scale living constructs create transport challenges that are not present in thin test specimens. The primary study incorporated microchannels in its printed architecture to support transport through the construct [1]. That is evidence for architecture as a design variable, not proof that one channel pattern solves transport generally.

Transport qualification should connect channel design to the actual construct dimensions, cell distribution, culture period and handling conditions. The relevant measurements may include geometric verification of open channels, spatial cell response, gradients in composition or mechanical state, and changes over time. The choice depends on the failure mode being controlled.

An external dimension alone is insufficient. A construct can meet its outline while internal paths are blocked, undersized or distorted. Conversely, an open channel network can compromise mechanical continuity or create a geometry unlike the intended product. Transport and structure therefore require simultaneous acceptance criteria.

7. Cell-supporting performance has a defined boundary

Cell viability, proliferation and differentiation are valid research endpoints when their methods, time points and acceptance logic are declared. Jeong et al. measured such endpoints in their bovine fibroblast-derived system [1]. The findings belong to that cell source, formulation, process and culture history.

They do not demonstrate human food safety, nutritional quality, sensory quality or regulatory approval. They also do not prove that another cell type, passage state, density or culture protocol will respond equivalently. A qualification report should therefore identify the biological model and avoid replacing it with broad language such as biocompatible or food-safe.

When a change is made to formulation, exposure, build geometry or post-processing, the effect on the biological endpoint should be screened rather than assumed. The required extent of retesting depends on the proposed claim and the mechanism by which the change can alter the cell environment.

8. Texture requires state-resolved measurement

Mechanical measurements can support process comparison, but they do not by themselves establish eating quality. The anchor study reported compression testing in its specific construct and included comparison after cooking within that experiment [1]. A similar compression response in one geometry and test method is not equivalence to meat texture.

A useful mechanical record should define specimen geometry, orientation, hydration or culture state, temperature, preparation, test mode, rate and analysis rule. If cooking or another transformation is involved, the pre- and post-treatment states should be distinguished. Results should be reported as properties of those declared states.

Texture qualification for a food claim would require a broader programme chosen for the intended product. Instrumental compression may be one component, but this review does not prescribe a universal target or infer sensory performance from it.

9. Food-grade is a system claim, not an ingredient adjective

The phrase food-grade should be reserved for a defined jurisdiction, intended use, exposure route and complete material/process state. It cannot be assigned merely because one ingredient has food use elsewhere. The primary anchor explicitly identifies material and culture-system limitations relevant to food translation [1].

At minimum, a future food-use argument would need to address the identity and purity of all intentionally added substances, source and variability of biological materials, residual and reaction products, process aids, contamination control, exposure conditions, post-processing and the final consumed or removed state. Which evidence is legally required remains outside ER-194 and must be determined by the applicable regulatory route.

Animal-derived gelatin and serum also raise sourcing, variability and product-positioning questions separate from print performance. Replacing them can change rheology, optical response, cure and cell behaviour. A nominally more acceptable ingredient set is therefore a new material state requiring requalification.

10. Process qualification should follow the claim

The qualification unit may be a research formulation, a printed batch, a construct or a complete food-biofabrication process. It should be named before testing. A study claiming only that a geometry can be produced requires a different evidence set from one claiming stable biological performance or food-use suitability.

ER-194 proposes the following linked sequence:

1. define the intended use and prohibited inferences;
2. identify the feedstock and biological state;
3. establish the formulation-specific optical and processing window;
4. verify external and internal geometry;
5. measure transport-relevant and cell-relevant outcomes over the declared period;
6. measure mechanical response in the state relevant to the claim;
7. assess residual chemistry and any food-use evidence through separate competent routes;
8. define the accepted state and change triggers.

The sequence is a qualification framework proposed by this review. It is not presented as a protocol validated by [1].

11. Scale-up is not implied by build size

A centimetre-scale demonstration is scientifically useful but does not establish industrial throughput, yield, equipment economics or mass-production control. Scaling the projected area, layer count or number of constructs can change light delivery, heat and mass transfer, feedstock residence time, sedimentation or cell history. The primary anchor is therefore correctly treated as proof of concept [1].

Scale-up evidence should be generated at the relevant equipment and production state. It should include uniformity across the build, repeatability between runs, material hold-time effects, cleaning and

contamination control, yield and the chosen biological and mechanical endpoints. No universal scale-up factor can be derived from the available anchor.

12. Change control

Potential requalification triggers include polymer or gelatin source, degree of functionalisation, photoinitiator identity or lot, optical modifier, culture supplement, cell source or state, solids concentration, mixing and hold history, printer or light engine, exposure strategy, layer thickness, construct geometry, channel architecture, build duration, culture period and post-processing.

Not every change requires a complete repeat, but each should be screened against the functions it can affect. A change to optical modifier can alter cure geometry as well as ingredient acceptability. A change to protein source can alter rheology, network formation, cell response and compositional claims. A geometry change can alter both transport and mechanical testing.

Bridging is acceptable only when the retained tests discriminate the relevant failure modes and the rationale is recorded.

13. Failure modes and discriminating tests

Loss of print fidelity can arise from inadequate local network formation, excessive cure spread, feedstock flow, optical variation or geometry. Reduced cell response can arise from formulation, exposure, transport, culture history or handling. A mechanical shift can arise from network state, hydration, architecture, cell contribution or test preparation. Similar symptoms therefore require competing hypotheses.

Discriminating measurements should be selected before corrective action. Examples include simple optical/cure coupons, dimensional inspection, channel patency checks, spatial rather than bulk biological readouts, chemical or extractable analysis, and mechanical tests with controlled state. These examples are proposed engineering tools, not a claim that every programme requires all of them.

Increasing exposure to correct weak geometry may change cell response or residual state. Increasing absorber to sharpen cure may change ingredient status and light penetration. Enlarging channels may improve transport while weakening structure. Corrective action is complete only when it resolves the target failure without violating another acceptance criterion.

14. Minimum reporting

A reusable report should identify the formulation components and their basis, biological model, preparation and hold history, printing equipment and light conditions, layer and geometry definitions, transport architecture, post-print handling, culture conditions, time points, print-fidelity method, biological assays, mechanical test state and any chemical or food-use evidence actually obtained.

It should distinguish measured results from assumptions, list deviations and state what the work does not qualify. If food-grade, edible, safe, scalable or meat-equivalent language is used, the specific evidence and applicable domain should be explicit.

15. Evidence limitations

This review is anchored to one directly read primary study. It therefore supports a bounded engineering interpretation, not a comprehensive systematic review. The formulation, printer, exposure, channel dimensions, cell density, culture periods and compression results in [1] remain study-specific and are intentionally not converted into generic recommendations.

Additional primary sources would be required to make comparative claims among photopolymers, initiators, alternative food-compatible systems, transport architectures or texture methods. Until such sources are directly read and logged, this manuscript makes no ranking and no universal numerical proposal.

16. Conclusions

Photocurable cultured-meat biofabrication is a coupled material, optical, biological and architectural problem. The directly read DLP/GelMA proof of concept demonstrates that centimetre-scale cell-laden structures, internal channels, cell-response measurements and mechanical testing can be integrated in one research workflow [1]. It simultaneously exposes the boundary between research feasibility and food qualification through acknowledged limitations in formulation and culture components [1].

The defensible qualification strategy is to keep distinct states distinct: feedstock identity, delivered optical process, cured network, internal geometry, cell-supporting response, mechanical test state and any later food-use determination. Evidence connecting those states should follow the exact intended claim. No single ingredient, viability result, compression value or successful print qualifies the complete system.

ER-194 therefore rejects automatic transfer from printable to food-grade, from viable cells to safe food, from compression similarity to sensory equivalence, and from a centimetre-scale demonstration to industrial scalability. Its contribution is a conservative framework for deciding what must be identified, measured and requalified before a narrower claim can be accepted.

Related Engineering Review boundaries

Generic photopolymer cure-depth and filled-resin optics remain with the relevant platform reviews. Food-contact and novel-food regulatory determinations remain outside ER-194. This paper owns the coupled scaffold/process qualification problem for photocurable cultured-meat and food-biofabrication research.

Reference

[1] Jeong, D.; Seo, J. W.; Lee, H.-G.; Jung, W. K.; Park, Y. H.; Bae, H. Efficient Myogenic/Adipogenic Transdifferentiation of Bovine Fibroblasts in a 3D Bioprinting System for Steak-Type Cultured Meat Production. *Advanced Science* 9 (2022) 2202877. <https://doi.org/10.1002/advs.202202877>

Competing interests

The author is Founder, CEO and CTO of 3Dresyns by Resyner Technologies S.L. This engineering review does not claim that any 3Dresyns product is qualified for food, food-contact or novel-food use.

Copyright

© 2026 Juan Segurola. All Rights Reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced, distributed or transmitted without the prior written permission of the copyright holder, except where permitted by applicable law.

Data availability

No new experimental dataset was generated for this review.